

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations **DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

Shepard Building 255 Westminster Street Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Enclosure 5d3 December 3, 2019

December 17, 2019

TO: Members of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education

FROM: Angélica Infante-Green, Commissioner

RE: New England Laborers Construction and Career Academy - Charter Renewal

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT, the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to renew the charter of New England Laborers Construction and Career Academy for 5 years, with conditions, for the term beginning with school year 2020-21 expiring at the end of school year 2024-2025. The conditions ensure the school closes the non-construction pathway and pursues an alternative accountability framework in partnership with RIDE and Cranston Public Schools.

Enclosed Documents:

The following documents provide further detail regarding the Commissioner's recommendation and analysis contributing to that recommendation:

- Commissioner's Recommendation Overview: including an overview of the charter.
- <u>RIDE's Renewal Report</u>: containing detailed information regarding the performance of the charter and findings as a result of the renewal site visit.
- <u>Charter's Response</u>: including additional information and context provided independently by the charter in regards to the renewal recommendation and report.
- <u>Annual Performance Dashboards</u>: containing detail on performance ratings for each school and each year of the charter's term.



Charter Overview:

Current Charter Overview							
Charter Type	District Charter	2018-19 Grades Served	9-12				
School-Year Opened	hool-Year Opened 2002-03		175				
Current Charter Term	urrent Charter Term 2015/16 - 2019/20		245 (Facility limited to 192 students)				
Statewide (Currently enrolling: Cranston, Providence, Johnston, Central Falls, Warwick Pawtucket, W. Warwick, E. Providence, N. Providence, and Portsmouth)		Location(s)	Cranston				

	School Mission and Model					
School Mission: The mission of New England Laborer's Construction and Career Academy (NELCO community fosters Respect, Responsibility, and Motivation by constructing pathwhope and confidence to meet the challenges of a global society."						
School Model:	The school focuses on providing a pathway for students in the field of Construction Craft Technology. It also offers a broader World of Work exploratory program. Students successfully graduating from the construction program are eligible for an apprenticeship program at the New England Laborers' Training Academy immediately following graduation. Students may then earn up to 20 credits towards an Associate's Degree in Technical Studies and Applied Science at the Community College of Rhode Island.					

Renewal Recommendation Overview:

	Summary of Recommendation					
Recommended Action:	The Commissioner recommends that the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to <u>renew</u> the charter of New England Laborers Construction and Career Academy for <u>5 years</u> , with conditions. The conditions ensure the school closes the non-construction pathway and pursues an alternative accountability framework in partnership with RIDE and Cranston Public Schools.					
Recommended Charter Term:	From SY2020-21 through SY2024-25					
Recommended Conditions:	The time-bound conditions address the charter's specific issues and deficiencies found throughout the renewal process. In addition to meeting the expectations of each renewal condition, the charter may be required to present its progress in meeting the conditions to the Council. The Commissioner, with the advice and consent of the Council, reserves the authority					



to take action, as outlined in the charter school regulations section 2.5 (200-RICR-20-05-2.2.5), should the charter not meet the expectations of the required renewal conditions.

1. Construction Program Goals and Assurances:

- a. By June 1, 2020, the charter and its construction partner must execute a written agreement that ensures all students successfully completing the construction pathway, upon turning 18, and meeting all identified employment requirements are prepared to participate in the General Construction phase of the apprenticeship program and are prioritized for job placement.
- b. By December 31, 2020, the construction program must meet the CTE Board standards for Construction Technology, and by June 2021, all students completing the construction pathway must earn the recognized CTE credentials, as outlined by the CTE Board standards.
- c. Beginning for SY2020-21, at least 75% of NELs students participate in the construction pathway and the World of Work pathway is closed.
- d. Annually, by November 15, the school will report the employment and postsecondary outcomes for all graduates with the previous two years, to RIDE and the Council.

2. Other Student Pathway Outcomes:

- a. Beginning for SY2020-21, the World of Work pathway is closed.
- b. By December 31, 2020, any new CTE program must meet the CTE Board standards as approved.
- c. By June 2021, all students not participating in the Construction Pathway, must complete an externally validated postsecondary learning experience, as defined by the Postsecondary Success metric in statewide accountability. These can be either Advanced Placement Credit, successful completion of a college course, or earning an approved CTE Board of Trustees credential.
- d. Annually, by November 15, the school will report the employment and postsecondary outcomes for all graduates with the previous two years, to RIDE and the Council.

3. Alternative Accountability Framework:

As part of the school's upcoming term, RIDE, Cranston and the leaders of NELCCA will work with alternative schools and programs to develop a statewide alternative school accountability framework. This framework will be applied to all alternative schools and programs and will not replace the charter performance framework in making renewal decisions.

School Overview:

Recommendation Key Points:

As an in-district charter, the school and the school's board have a strong, collaborative working relationship as well as a productive relationship with Cranston Public Schools. As a statewide charter, and RIDE-approved CTE program, the school also enrolls students from across the state. However, Cranston Public Schools provides oversight, resources, and operational and student support services in many areas. These include, personnel, finances, special education and English Learner services and supports and curriculum, and the school abides by Cranston Public Schools policies and procedures.

The school has autonomy over their construction pathway, the school's facility lease, budget, and the school has some flexibilities in the classroom. The school's board is made up of members from the Cranston School Committee, the Cranston Superintendent, a Laborer's



International Union of North American (LIUNA) representative, trade representatives, community members and a parent. Many students (see alternative school pattern data below) enroll in the school in upper grades and have attended high school elsewhere, on multiple occasions.

Construction Pathway Overview:

The construction pathway enjoys a strong partnership with LIUNA and the school has solidified its partnership through board representation. Most students who attend the school pursue the construction pathway. However, specific goal-setting and performance measures related to the outcomes of the construction pathway are lacking. Additionally, students who decide not to pursue construction are limited in their options and are not being set up for postsecondary success.

- While currently, all students are reported as enrolled in the program, according to the school leader, approximately 70% of students are enrolled in the construction pathway. Students entering their sophomore year decide whether to fully pursue construction or choose the World of Work pathway.
 - The Board receives reports on the number of students who are on track for the apprenticeship program and the number of students who successfully complete the program after high school. However, specific goals related to number or percentages of students successfully completing these milestones are not set
 - Despite having a RIDE-approved CTE construction program, no students earned a recognized credential for the class of 2018.

Construction Program Outcome Data:

The conditions set forth ensure the school and its construction partner create a specific agreement related to student postsecondary outcomes. The school reported the construction pathway outcomes for students over the last four years.

- The percentage of the graduating class enrolled in the construction program has ranged from 24-100%.
- The percentage of the seniors enrolled in the construction program who completed the preapprenticeship program and registered for the post-high school apprenticeship training has ranged from 64-100%.
- The percentage of students who completed the apprenticeship training and began working towards journey-worker status ranged from 67-92%.
- The percent of the whole graduating class currently employed in construction trades (LIUNA and outside LIUNA, that could be verified) ranged from 20-31%. The percent of the graduating class enrolled in the construction program who are current employed in construction trades ranged from 57-83%.

Academic Performance Summary

The charter's has struggled with academic achievement over the course of its term. In 2019, the school received a 1-star rating, resulting in a Does Not Meet rating on the charter School Performance indicator, and the school received a Does Not Meet rating on the charter School Comparison indicator.

- School Identification: For 2018-19, the school exited CSI identification.
- <u>SAT Proficiency Data:</u> For 2018-19, 15.79% of students where proficient in ELA and 0% of students were proficient in Math.



- <u>ELA Growth:</u> In 2018-19, 36% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 46% typical growth, and 19% high growth. In 2017-18, 35% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 47% typical growth, and 18% high growth.
- Math Growth: In 2018-19, 41% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 39% typical growth, and 20% high growth. In 2017-18, 45% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 45% typical growth, and 10% high growth.
- <u>Weighted Average Comparison</u>: In 2018 and 2019, the school performed lower than a weighted average of its sending districts in both ELA and Math.

Statewide Accountability Results Summary

Statewide Accountability Results Summary						
Year	Rating	Achievement	Growth	ELP		
2018-19	1- Star	ELA 1 of 4 pts Index 27 of 100	ELA 1 of 3 pts. Index 0.83 of 2	Not enough students		
		Math 1 of 4 pts Index 13 of 100	Math 1 of 3 pts. Index 0.79 of 2			
2017-18	1- Star (Identified for CSI)	ELA 1 of 4 pts Index 27 of 100 Math 1 of 4 pts Index 13 of 100	ELA 1 of 3 pts. Index 0.82 of 2 Math 1 of 3 pts. Index 0.65 of 2	Not enough students		
2016-17	CIS: 44 (Focus)	ELA 12 of 20 pts Math 8 of 20 pts	N/A	N/A		
2015-16	CIS: 40 (Focus)	ELA 8 of 20 pts Math 8 of 20 pts	N/A	N/A		

Alternative School Enrollment Pattern:

- 38% of students in the graduating class of 2017 (26 students), started at NELs in 9th grade
- 46% of students in the graduating class of 2018 (37 students), started at NELs in 9th grade

Overview of Charter Performance Ratings:

	Indicators	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19
emic	(1A) School Performance	DNM	DNM	DNM	DNM
Academic	(1B) School Comparison	DNM	DNM	DNM	DNM
Sustainability	(1) Financial	М	М	M	M
ainal	(2) Organizational	M	M	M	M
Sust	(3) Compliance	M	M	M	M
	Renewal Process Tier	Tier 4. In-Depth Renewal Process			
	Updated Tier Designation		Tier 4 (Acaden	nics)	

	Ratings Key						
Е	Does Not Meet Expectations						
M Meets Expectations		NR	Not Rated				
Α	Approaches Expectations	NA	Not Applicable				



ABOUT THIS REPORT

In 2015, RIDE embarked on a process to revise the existing charter performance framework based on lessons learned over 5 years of implementation and alignment to national best practice. The updated Charter School Performance Review System was created in collaboration with a committee of charter school practitioners and the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. The purpose of the revision was to increase transparency of charter performance review, provide clarity on charter's performance annually, and ensure consistency of decisions that prioritize the school's academic performance. The 2016-17 school year was the first year of implementation, and all charter schools received 2015-16 performance ratings applied retroactively to initiate the new performance framework.

This report comprises performance ratings for the previous four years of the charter's term (2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19). Performance ratings utilize data from school-generated annual reports and other RIDE monitoring results. As part of the renewal process, RIDE provided initial renewal tier designations, based off the two most recent years of available data, to inform the renewal process. The final tier designation is updated based on results from the 2018-19 school year.

The New England Laborers/Cranston Public Schools, Construction and Career Academy (NELCCA) initially received a "Tier 4" designation due to Academic results in School Comparison and followed the in-depth renewal process. The renewal site visit was conducted over a two-day period in late May 2019. To prepare for the site visit, the team, comprised of RIDE staff from the Division of Innovation, reviewed the charter's performance reports to date, the charter's renewal application, and programmatic and organizational documentation submitted by the school. The site visit consisted of classroom observations and interviews with the charter school board, all members of the school's leadership team, teachers, parents, and students. The site visit is an integral part of the team's ability to corroborate information provided by the charter school, follow up on areas of the school's operations that are not meeting performance expectations and ensure the team has gathered information to help determine performance ratings for the Organizational and Compliance Indicators.



CHARTER OVERVIEW

The New England Laborers/Cranston Public Schools, Construction and Career Academy (NELCCA) is a district charter school in Cranston Public Schools, serving students statewide. The charter opened in 2002, serving grades 9-12, with a total potential enrollment of 245 students, but due to limited facility capacity, current enroll approximately 175 students. The school focuses on providing a pathway for students in the field of Construction Craft Technology. It also offers a broader World of Work exploratory program. Students successfully graduating from the construction program are eligible for an apprenticeship program at the New England Laborers' Training Academy immediately following graduation. Students may then earn up to 20 credits towards an Associate's Degree in Technical Studies and Applied Science at cooperating colleges through the National College Credit Recommendation Service (NCCRS), including the Community College of Rhode Island.

The mission of the NELCCA: ""Our school community fosters Respect, Responsibility, and Motivation by constructing pathways that inspire hope and confidence to meet the challenges of a global society."

Enrollment Demographic Information

Descriptive demographics are based on October enrollment data reported to RIDE by the charter school and reported publicly by RIDE.

[Enrollment numbers will be updated based on October 1 enrollment]

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Total Enrollment	170	164	163	175
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligibility	65.9%	68.9%	76.7%	72.0%
Students Receiving Special Education Services	18.8%	13.4%	23.9%	26.3%
Students Receiving ESL Services	2.9%	3.7%	8.0%	6.9%
Multiracial	1.8%	3.0%	1.8%	6.3%
African-American	5.3%	3.7%	6.1%	8.0%
Latino/Hispanic	25.9%	32.9%	35.6%	30.3%
Native American	1.8%	1.2%	1.2%	1.7%
Asian	0%	0.6%	1.2%	0%
Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%
White/Caucasian	65.3%	58.5%	54.0%	53.7%



PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

NELCCA received a "Tier 4" final tier designation for the renewal process due to its overall ratings in Academic Performance. NELCCA initially received a "Tier 4" designation due to academic performance and followed the indepth renewal process.

The charter met expectations in each overall sustainability indicator in each year. In all years of the term, the charter did not meet expectations for Academic Performance. As a result, RIDE conducted the School Comparison analysis, which found the school "Did Not Meet Expectations," in each year. Moreover, in the 2018-19 school year, NELCCA received a "Does Not Meet" expectation in both School Performance and School Comparison. Additional information for each indicator and criteria rating is included in this report.

Each indicator's specific criteria ratings inform an overall indicator rating. Each charter receives a detailed annual performance report that identifies ratings for each individual criteria and overall indicators. These performance reports accompany the renewal report.

	Indicators	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19
Academic	(1A) School Performance	DNM	DNM	DNM	DNM
Acad	(1B) School Comparison	DNM	DNM	DNM	DNM
oility	(1) Financial	M	M	M	М
Sustainability	(2) Organizational	M	M	M	М
Sust	(3) Compliance	М	М	M	М
Renewal Process Tier		Tier 4. In-Depth Renewal Process			
Updated Tier Designation			Tier 4 (Acader	nics)	

Ratings Key						
E Exceeds Expectations DNM Does Not Meet Exp						
M	Meets Expectations	NR	Not Rated			
A Approaches Expectations			Not Applicable			



PRIMARY INDICATOR: ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

School Performance						
SY15-16 SY16-17 SY17-18 SY18-19						
Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations			

Summary: Academic data is available for the 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years.

For the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years, the school received a CIS score of 40 and 44 (respectively), and was identified at a "Focus" level per RIDE's school classification system under the ESEA waiver. In 2015-16 and 2016-17, the "Does Not Meet" expectations rating triggered the completion of the School Comparison sub-indicator. In both years, the school did not meet expectations on any of the measurable criteria in the indicator. At that time under RIDE's school classification system under the ESEA, the criteria were proficiency compared to enrolling districts, gap closure, and growth.

In the 2017-18 school year, the school earned one star on the new statewide accountability system and was identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement due to overall academic achievement. This triggered the completion of the School Comparison sub-indicator. The school did not meet expectation on school Comparison because it did not reliability outperform its sending district and earned only one point for growth in both ELA and Math. In the school year 2018-19, the school earned one-star on statewide accountability, again triggering the school comparison indicator. The school did not outperform its sending district, earning them a "Does Not Meet" rating in the school comparison category.

Through a review of documents, the charter's renewal application, and on-site interviews, there is evidence that the school utilizes internal academic data as well as state assessment data to internally evaluate its academic achievement. The school utilizes the STAR assessment for interim evaluations of student performance in Math and ELA.

School Comparison						
SY15-16 SY16-17 SY17-18 SY18-19						
Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations			

In each year of the term, RIDE conducted an analysis of the School Comparison sub-indicator due to the school receiving a "Does Not Meet" expectations rating for the School Performance sub-indicator. Based on this analysis, the school was rated as "Does Not Meet" expectations for the School Comparison sub-indicator due



to receiving an "Does Not Meet" rating on criteria 1.B.1 and other criteria.

The school "Did Not Meet Expectations," in all years because the school's proficiency rate compared to its enrolling district, including accounting for margin of error, was not above a weighted average of its sending district in Math or ELA. Meaning, the school performed lower than its sending district in Math and ELA. In 2016-17, the school had too few students tested for evaluation in statewide accountability.

2015-16							
Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts		
ELA	6.9%	3.8%	3.1%	10.7%	29.6%		
Math	0%	0%	0%	0%	13.8%		

1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts

2016-17					
Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	10.7%	4.8%	5.9%	15.5%	28.5%
Math	Too few students tested for evaluation in statewide accountability				

2017-18					
Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	16%	5.77%	5.3%	13.1%	43.8%
Math	0%	0%	0%	0%	23.9%

	2018-19				
Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	15.79	5.55	10.24	21.34	42.01



	Math	0.00	-	-	-	17.70	
1.B.2 English Language Proficiency	In 2015-16 and 2016-17, under the ESEA and the measures that made up RIDE's school classification system, criterion 1.B.2 reflected the gap closure measure. The school not meet expectations for gap closure because its performance fell in the bottom performance range for ELA and the second to bottom range for Math. In 2017-18, under the new statewide accountability system, this criterion measures English Learner's progress in language attainment as measured by the ACCESS test. This criterion was not rated because the school did not have enough EL students to make an accountability determination. In 2018-19, two years of data were combined to ensure a higher N-size for the analysis. The school did not meet expectations on this criterion, due to earning only one ELP point as measured by the statewide accountability system. The school's ELP index score was 29 out of 110.						
1.B.3 Growth	In 2015-16 and 2016-17, under the ESEA and the measures that made up RIDE's school classification system, criterion 1.B.3 for high schools, reflected graduation rate. The school did not meet expectations in either year because its composite graduation rate was below 75%, at 67.5% and 72.3% respectively. In 2017-18, while graduation rate was not factored in this criterion, the school's composite graduation was 77%. The school "Did Not Meet Expectations," in 2017-18 because it earned one point for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.82 out of 2. The school earned one point for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.65 out of 2. In 2018-19, school "Did Not Meet Expectations," because it earned one point for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.83 out of 2. It earned one point for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.79 out of 2.				ation site 8, site point ne		

SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 1

Financial Performance				
SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19	
Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	

Summary

The charter received an overall "Meets Expectations" annual rating in Financial Performance for each year of its term with the exception of 2018-19 because one criterion was rated "Does Not Meet Expectations." Financial ratings are based primarily on the charter's audit and therefore, financial information lags a year. For



example, financial ratings for 2018-19 are based on the charter's FY18 audit.

The board's finance committee is most involved in fiscal oversight of the charter in partnership with the Executive Director and Finance Manager. It meets monthly and reports to the larger board. The finance committee works with Executive Director and Finance Manager set and revise the budget before going to the full board for approval. Additional information regarding financial management can be found in Compliance criteria 3.20-3.28.

1.1 Current Ratio	The charter met expectations each year.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	The charter met expectations each year.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	The charter met expectations each year.
1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	The charter met expectations in 2016-17 and approached expectations in 2015-16, 2017-18 and 2018-19 because the total margin was negative.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	The debt service coverage ratio is not rated. The charter did not have principal and interest payment in each applicable year.

SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 2

Organizational Performance				
SY15-16 SY16-17 SY17-18 SY18-19				
Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	
Summary : All annual ratings and each criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations," with the exception of criterion 2.2 in 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19.				
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	L School-specific goals were not established over the course of this term			



	The charter met expectations in 2015-16 and approached expectations in this criterion in 2016-17 and 2017-18 due to attendance rate.
	The charter's attendance rate in 2016-17 was 83.40%, lower than the state high school average of 90.88%. In 2017-18, the charter's attendance rate was 85.48%, lower than the state high school average of 90.83% The charter's attendance rate in 2018-19 was 87.17%, lower than the state high school average of 90.91%
	Student retention met expectations in each year with over 80% of students choosing to return to the school each year.
2.2 School Environment	The school relies on its student information system platform to communicate with parents and families. A new parent board member is undertaking a social media project to foster better communication between the school and parents. The school hosts open houses and awards nights for students. While there is evidence of parent and family engagement, stakeholder interviews highlighted that it could be stronger with parents and students noting that contact home only happens for negative circumstances.
	SurveyWorks data show 56% (the state average is 42%) of students responding favorably to questions related to school climate, and 79% (the state average is 71%) of families responding favorably to questions related to school climate.
	Use of attrition data and applicant pool composition were not a factor of this criterion until the 16-17 school year. The charter met expectations each year.
2.3 Equity and Access	School administrators and the board review attrition data and other relevant enrollment data each month. Stakeholder interviews confirmed that the board and school administrators discuss recruitment strategies and closely monitor the reasons why students leave the school. The school conducts exit interviews, and the most noted reason is transportation for students coming from outside of the transportation region. School administrators have worked with RIPTA to improve transportation options for students. The board noted that student retention is a primary focus of theirs, recognizing that recruitment drives enrollment, and student retention drives the revenues and budget for the school.
	School administrator's recruitment efforts focus on visiting each Cranston middle school, promoting the school on social media, hosting open houses and demonstrations, and attending the League of Charter Schools annual fair. The school administrators noted challenges to conduct middle school visits outside of Cranston or directly recruit from other districts. The New Englander Laborers' assist the school and pay for more traditional marketing and advertising to assist in recruitment. In prior years, the school did not have enough applicants to conduct a lottery. Since 2017-18, the school had more applicants than spots available and 2019 was the 2019 lottery was the first year the school had a waitlist. The school's lottery policy lacks detail and the school's board demonstrated limited knowledge of its details. It is not clear if the school board formally votes and adopts the lottery and enrollment policy.



	Stakeholder interviews noted confusion about the application and enrollment process, whether enrollment requires an interview or not and regarding preference for Cranston residents. The school's policy is being updated to be more clear and detailed.
	The school serves students statewide, currently coming from 12 cities and town, but the majority of its students reside in Cranston. The school's demographics mirror that of Cranston, serving about the same percentage of English Learners and higher percentages of students with IEPs and students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch.
2.4 Dissemination	The 2016-17 school year is the first year this criterion was evaluated. The charter met expectations each year. The school collaborates with LIUNA (Laborers International Union of North America) and is an active participant in their annual roundtables and events as well as organizing visits to the school for elementary students. The school also presented at the PrepareRI summit in 2019 on the topic of career exploration.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	The charter met expectations each year. The board currently has 9 voting members, including members of the Cranston School Committee, the Cranston Superintendent, LIUNA representatives, Contractors, community members and a parent. It operates informal standing committees (Academic Program, Financial, and Student Improvement). Stakeholder interviews confirmed that the school's board and the Cranston school committee are each involved in decision-making for the school. Many decisions require the approval of both the board and school committee, such as the hiring of staff outside of the Director. The board noted that the school has autonomy from Cranston Public Schools through their facility lease, budget and some flexibilities in the classroom. For example, the school has piloted academic intervention programs and has ownership over its curriculum for the Construction pathway. In many areas, such as personnel, finances, special education and English Learner services and supports and curriculum, the school abides by Cranston Public Schools policies and procedures. The school and the school's board have a strong, collaborative working relationship. Cranston Public Schools is responsible for many areas such as; special education services staff, English learner support and staff, curriculum support and materials, buses for Cranston students, food service, school counselor and social worker. The school's budget is responsible for paying for curriculum materials and busing for non-Cranston residents. The Board, School Leaders and teachers all noted the overarching goals for the most recent year focused on blended learning, improving attendance, professional development and academic growth measured by the STAR assessment. The district's STAR assessment goal is a 35 SGP and each quarter school administrators report to
	the board on overall academic achievement. With the addition of the Comprehensive Support and Improvement identification, the whole board is engaged in improvement
2.5 Board and	Union of North America) and is an active participant in their annual roundtables and events as well as organizing visits to the school for elementary students. The school also presented at the PrepareRI summit in 2019 on the topic of career exploration. The charter met expectations each year. The board currently has 9 voting members including members of the Cranston School Committee, the Cranston Superintender LIUNA representatives, Contractors, community members and a parent. It operates informal standing committees (Academic Program, Financial, and Student Improvement). Stakeholder interviews confirmed that the school's board and the Cranston school committee are each involved in decision-making for the school. Madecisions require the approval of both the board and school committee, such as the hiring of staff outside of the Director. The board noted that the school has autonom from Cranston Public Schools through their facility lease, budget and some flexibilit in the classroom. For example, the school has piloted academic intervention progra and has ownership over its curriculum for the Construction pathway. In many areas such as personnel, finances, special education and English Learner services and supports and curriculum, the school abides by Cranston Public Schools policies and procedures. The school and the school's board have a strong, collaborative working relationship. Cranston Public Schools is responsible for many areas such as; special education services staff, English learner support and staff, curriculum support and materials, buses for Cranston students, food service, school counselor and social worker. The school's budget is responsible for paying for curriculum materials and busing for non-Cranston residents. The Board, School Leaders and teachers all noted the overarching goals for the mos recent year focused on blended learning, improving attendance, professional development and academic growth measured by the STAR assessment. The district STAR assessment goal is a 35 SGP and each quarte



and is acting as the school's CAB (Community Advisory Board). The Board's construction members and LIUNA members report out on the number of students who are on track for the apprenticeship program and the number of students who successfully complete the program after high school. Specific goals related to number or percentages of students successfully completing these milestones are not set. The board could not speak to specific academic achievement or progress goals. The approach is focused on reporting out and relying on school administrator reports. Through the CAB process, the school board has an opportunity to set and oversee more concrete academic achievement goals, as well as defined credit recovery, construction pathway and postsecondary achievement goals.

The Cranston Superintendent, who is also a board member, conducts the annual evaluation of the Executive Director, following the Cranston Public School process. She shares the high-level results with the board each year. Other school administrators are evaluated by the Executive Director, abiding by the Cranston Public School process, with the exception of the Academic Dean who is a contractor and not employed by Cranston Public Schools.

SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 3

	Compliance						
SY15-16	SY16-17 SY17-18		SY18-19				
Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations				
Summary: The charter Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	associated with student right monitoring civil rights, specia on Cranston Public Schools to learner identification, service The charter has submitted th process was monitored in the family interviews and the rev	the charter met expectations s, according to the various RIE I education, English learners, a coordinate and provide spec	for each of the criteria DE offices responsible for and Title 1. The school relies ial education and English Fort each year and its lottery hool has noted the results of ss and is updating their				



Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Over the course of the term, the charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with employee management to the various RIDE offices responsible for certification and educator evaluation. The Cranston Superintendent evaluates the Executive Director who serves as the principal for the school. The Executive Director conducts the evaluation for the assistant principal. The Board chair and LIUNA board members evaluate the Academic Dean. The school follows Cranston's evaluation process for other administrators and relies on the Consortium I3 model to evaluate the teachers. Human resources procedures all follow the policies provided by Cranston Public Schools.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	The charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with health and safety, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for school health services and food service. The charter provided documentation of facilities inspections and other related documentation. The student and parent handbook addresses policies and procedures for student safety and discipline. The assistant principal is primarily responsible for implementing discipline policies and procedures.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	The educational program of the charter is focused on two pathways: construction technology and world of work. The charter met expectations in each year. School documents note that the school aims for every student to be placed in an internship, apprenticeship work environment or employment. All construction students have the opportunity for a guaranteed 4-week apprenticeship with the New England Laborers upon successful graduation and completion of the construction program at the high school. This apprenticeship, once completed after high school, provides students the potential to earn up to 20 credits towards an Associate's Degree at cooperating colleges through NCCRS in Technical Studies and Applied Science.
	There was evidence that in all grades and in all core content areas that the charter has implemented curricula that are aligned to statewide standards. The school is required to follow Cranston Public School's curriculum in core subjects and has the autonomy to pilot new programs and create their curriculum for the construction program. The school currently splits Algebra over two years, and there was concern that students are not receiving four full years of math coursework.
	The charter has submitted all required information via statewide data reporting tools including but not limited to TCS, enrollment and attendance.
	The charter's school calendar follows Cranston Public Schools complies with the required length of school day and year.
School Leadership	The charter met expectations in each of the criteria associated with this compliance



(3.17-3.19)	area. The board's bylaws were updated in 2019 and include a conflicts of interest and complaints policy. The board files its meeting agendas with the Secretary of State and meetings are open to the public as required by state law.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	The charter met expectations each year. The organization has a finance manager and the board takes an active role in setting and managing the budget and long term planning. In 2010, the school established a separate budget and fiscal manager from Cranston Public Schools. The finance manager presents school financial monthly to the board. She works closely with the Executive Director on day-to-day monitoring of the school's budget. The annual budget is reviewed and approved by the school's board.



Honorable Members of the Rhode Island Board of Education 255 Westminster Street Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Dear Council Members:

The board, administration, faculty and staff would like to thank the RIDE Charter School Office as well as the Commissioner of Education for their thoughtful feedback regarding the evaluation of NEL/CPS Construction & Career Academy (NEL's). We appreciate this opportunity to respond to said report with additional context and clarification regarding the overall health of our charter school.

NEL's serves a statewide population primarily from the urban and urban ring districts. Approximately 72% of our students are eligible for free or reduced lunch, 26.3% receive Special Education Services and approximately 58% on average did not start with us in 9_{th} grade.

Academic Performance Summary:

Although 34% of the Junior class, who took the SAT's in spring of 2019 were new to NEL's, we are encouraged that their growth scores were enough to exit the school from CSI status. We continue on a positive trajectory for Graduation Rate and Attendance Rate over the last four years. Our Graduation Rate has improved to 78.3% and our Attendance Rate to 87.2%. That being said, it is clear there is still a long way to go.

Approximately 70% of our student population come to us below grade level in both Reading and Math, most of whom enroll during their second or third year of high school. To address this, we have taken a universal approach to reading intervention. We have implemented the Achieve 3000 program for reading support and deliver this to all students in grades 9-11. The established goal for each student for yearly Average Lexile Gain is 50L. Our students have outperformed this goal for the last three years with a mean Average Lexile Gain of 99.7L.

Math scores are of the utmost concern. Students have been supported with math intervention classes for several years yet satisfactory growth goals are not being met. We are taking a more universal approach this year, similar to our reading intervention, by using the IXL program. Our math staff has just completed an intensive professional development series for IXL and we look forward to progress monitoring student growth over the next several years. In time, we are confident that the markers will move in the right direction.

Although math proficiency remains a challenge, NEL's has been recognized by Rhode Island Student Loan Authority (RISLA) each year since 2012 for our integration of their Financial Literacy program: Financial Education for Students.

Looking back, we can note the last opportunity for longitudinal standardized data was NECAP. Over a three-year period, students made gains of 24% in Reading Proficiency on NECAP, the highest gains of any high school in the state and the math proficiency doubled in that same period. We are confident that our students will start to make significant gains in SAT Achievement and Growth.

CSI:

Although NEL's has exited from CSI status, much was learned from the process associated with the designation. We benefitted from the designation with substantial CSI funding support and the development of a strong and viable 3-year CSI Plan that addresses the very concerns mentioned within this renewal report. We are moving forward with the plan to carry out and progress monitor the goals and interventions set in place.

Construction Pathway Overview

We are proud that NEL's Construction Craft Laborer program was endorsed for a 5-year approval by RIDE's CTE Office in October of 2018. We participated in the new comprehensive application process and know we will be a valued participant. The construction program meets the needs of the Governor's Work Force Board(GWB), priority sector demands for Construction and we are the only program that focuses on heavy and highway construction. As we move forward with the GWB's requirement for 80 hours of Work Based Learning hours, it has already been noted that our program is a prime example of successful Work Based Learning experiences. Our students logging well over one hundred hours at the completion of the program and have a direct line to a sustainable wage career through the apprenticeship training experience.

Please note: On page 4 of the Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation it was stated that "Despite having a RIDE-approved CTE construction program, no students earned a recognized credential for the Class of 2018". We would like to point out that NEL's was not approved for CTE endorsement until October 26, 2018. Likewise, the only credential accepted at this time for the Career Field: Carpenter Helper is completion of NCCER Level 1 & 2. We do not use NCCER curriculum. Our curriculum developed by LIUNA's Education and Training Fund was approved by the CTE Advisory Board last year and we are currently in the process, with the other CTE construction programs in the State, of getting the standards updated with the addition of multiple credential recognition.

Valued Partnerships:

Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA):

Our construction program is robust because of the relationship and support of LIUNA. LIUNA provides curriculum and materials support, industry certified personnel, including but not limited to instructors and apprenticeship coordinators, and funding for innovative expansions such Plastic Pipe Fusion to meet current industry demands. Above all, we benefit from the opportunity LIUNA provides with the New England Laborers Training Academy (NELTA). Our students who graduate from the construction program have the opportunity to enter the apprenticeship program at NELTA upon graduation. The benefits our construction graduates receive are memorialized in an MOU with the Rhode Island District Council, JATC; Rhode Island State Apprenticeship Council; and Rhode Island Office of BAT, supporting the transition from high school to the apprenticeship training program. We are the only high school in the State benefitting from an MOU with these councils.

Cranston Public Schools (CPS):

As a district charter school, we are fortunate to have a strong, healthy, and collaborative relationship with CPS. We are considered the third high school in Cranston and adhere to all the accountability systems and policies set in place by the CPS School Committee. We benefit from resources including but not limited to: certain staffing, transportation for Cranston students, the lunch program, and aligned curriculum. We value our collaborative relationship with the Superintendent of Schools who contributes monthly as a member of our Board of Directors.

Moving Forward:

We appreciate the candid dialogue with the Commissioner of Education and RIDE's Charter School Office regarding next steps for NEL's. Our Construction Craft Laborer program is strong and viable and meets our mission well, serving as a solid foundation for the next phase. Likewise, we do not disagree with the findings that we need to redesign a supporting pathway and to assess how NEL's can best support the at-risk populations that we serve. Participating with alternative schools to develop an Alternative Accountability Framework will help to frame our reference for moving forward.

We are confident that through a collaborative effort with Cranston and RIDE's Charter School and CTE Offices, we can accomplish the best outcome for NEL's and the students we serve. We are approaching this as an opportunity to help define how education can look differently to help serve the needs of at-risk students.

This is a vast undertaking and we appreciate the Board and RIDE's understanding that this will take time. We respectfully request that you approve the Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation as put forth in the document provided.



Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	School is at "Focus" or "Priority" level	The school was identified as a Focus school under the most recent state classifications. The school's composite index score was 40. RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2015-16.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."	The school received a rating of "Does Not Meet" on B.1, B.2 and B.3
1.B1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	Does Not Meet Expectations	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in Math, ELA or both.	Both ELA and Math proficiency rate plus error were below the weighted average proficiency rate of enrolling districts. ELA: 6.9% + error 3.8 = 10.7% Weighted Avg of Enrolling: 29.6% Math: 0% + error 0 = 0% Weighted Avg of Enrolling: 13.8%
1.B2 Gap Closure	Does Not Meet Expectations	The gap between the mean scale score of the lowest quartile and proficiency for ELA and Math falls within the bottom two ranges as	The school's ELA performance fell in the bottom range and Math fell in the second to bottom range



		published within the school accountability system.	
1.B3 Graduation Rate (High Schools)	Does Not Meet Expectations	The school's graduation rate is below 75	The school's composite graduation rate as published on the accountability report card was 67.5%

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	The school was rated as "Approaches" in criterion 1.4 and meets in all other criteria.
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio was 18.58.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	Not Rated		Days of Cash is not reported for District Charters
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	The GASB 68 pension accounting standards requirement resulted in the school reporting a deficit net position on its FY15 audited financial statements and a debt to asset ratio of 1.38. The deficit net position is not the result of an operating deficit but results from recognition of its proportionate share of the state's pension liability for its teachers. The school's financial statements present a positive net position before the effect of the GASB 68 reporting requirements. The calculation used to determine the school's debt to asset ratio of 0.17 was based total liabilities and assets before the effect of GASB 68 reporting.



1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Approaches Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is negative OR The most recent year total margin is negative	Aggregated three-year total margin was 0.02 and the most recent year's total margin was -0.03.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		Debt Service Coverage Ratio will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		RIDE did not establish school specific goals in academic year 2015-16.
2.2 School Environment	Meets Expectations	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE. AND There is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families. AND at least 80% of students in non-break grades	Family engagement: The school provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Student attendance rate and student retention will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.



		return to school the next year.	
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	Recruitment & Lottery: No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle. Use of attrition data & applicant pool composition will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.
2.4 Dissemination	Not Rated		Dissemination efforts will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	Meets Expectations	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: The school provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication: The school provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report.



	aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	Board Holds School Leader Accountable: The school provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.
--	--	---

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criteria not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. IDEA: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. Title III (English Language Learners): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.



			Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicatord.	Educator Certification: A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. HR Procedures: The school provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Facility Assurances: Facility Assurances will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year. School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. Food Service: Food Service will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year. Behavior & Safety Policies: The school provided evidence of behavior and safety policies in the Annual School Health Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Educational Program: The school provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Curriculum Standards: The school provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report.



			Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting. School Day/Length Policy: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report for the Charter office.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Board Bylaws: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: School complied with budget submissions. Quarterly Financial Reporting: School complied with Quarterly financial reports. UCOA Reporting: School complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. Annual Financial Audit: The school's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. Single Audit: N/A



Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	School is at "Focus" or "Priority" level	The school was identified as a Focus school under the most recent state classifications. The school's composite index score was 44. RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2016-17.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."	The school received a rating of "Does Not Meet" on B.1, B.2 and B.3
1.B1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	Does Not Meet Expectations	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in Math, ELA or both.	The school's ELA proficiency rate plus error were below the weighted average proficiency rate of enrolling districts. There were too few students to measure the school's Math proficiency rate for statewide accountability. ELA school proficiency: 10.7% + error 4.8 = 15.5% The Weighted Avg of Proficiency of Enrolling districts: 28.5% Math: too few students for evaluation
1.B2 Gap Closure	Does Not Meet Expectations	The gap between the mean scale score of the lowest quartile and proficiency for ELA and Math falls within the bottom two ranges as	The school's ELA performance fell in the bottom range of cut scores and Math fell in the second to bottom range of cut cores.



		published within the school accountability system.	
1.B3 Graduation Rate (High Schools)	Does Not Meet Expectations	The school's graduation rate is below 75	The school's composite graduation rate as published on the accountability report card was 72.3%

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail			
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2016-17, the ratings reflect the information in the FY16 audit for the organization.			
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 18.58			
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	Not Rated		Days of Cash is not reported for District Charters			
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.16. The GASB 68 pension accounting standards requirement resulted in the school reporting a deficit net position on its FY16 audited financial statements and a debt to asset ratio of 1.44. The deficit net position is not the result of an operating deficit but results from recognition of its proportionate share of the state's pension liability for its teachers. The school's financial statements present a positive net position before the effect of the GASB 68 reporting requirements. The calculation used to determine the school's debt to asset ratio of 0.16 was based total liabilities and assets before the effect of GASB 68 reporting.			



1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Meets Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.05. The three-year aggregate margin was 0.032.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		The debt service coverage ratio is not applicable. The charter did not have principal or interest payments in FY16

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail			
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations," with the exception of 2.2 which was rated "Approaches Expectations."			
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 201 17.			
2.2 School Environment	Approaches Expectations	One of the following is true: The school's attendance rate is lower than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE There is no evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families	Student Attendance: The school's attendance rate was 83.40%, lower than the state high school average of 90.88% Family engagement: The charter provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Student Retention: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.			



		Fewer 80% of students in non- break grades return to school the next year.	
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	Attrition Data: The charter provided assurances of attrition data analysis in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Recruitment & Lottery: No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle. Applicant Pool: The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2017 lottery shows applicants from Cranston and the surrounding communities.
2.4 Dissemination	Meets Expectations	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	Sharing and Partnership: The charter provided assurances and descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	Meets Expectations	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to:	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: The charter provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/



student academic succeptionities that are aligned the school's mission, and educational philosophy board and school leads implement clear and wounderstood systems for making and communiceprocesses. AND There that the Board holds the leader accountable.	making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Board Holds School Leader Accountable: The charter provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School- Prepared Annual Report. Prepared Annual Report.
--	--

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail		
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."		
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance	Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. IDEA: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.		



		indicator.	English Language Learners: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Educator Certification: A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. HR Procedures: The charter provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Facility Documentation & Assurances: The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report. School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. Food Service: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. Behavior & Safety Policies: The charter provided assurances of behavior and safety policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in	Educational Program: The charter provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report.



		the Compliance Performance indicator.	Curriculum Standards: The charter provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting. School Day/Length Policy: The charter school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Board Bylaws: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: The charter complied with budget submissions. Quarterly Financial Reporting: The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports. UCOA Reporting: The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. Annual Financial Audit: The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. Single Audit: N/A



Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail		
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	1.A.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet" and 1.A.2 is rated as "Exceeds," "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's star rating was 1-star, and the school was identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement due to Achievement and Growth, and Overall Low Performance. The school did have RIDE-approved school specific goals in 2017-18.		

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail					
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."	The school was rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" on criterion 1.B.1 and 1.B.3. Criterion 1.B.2 was not rated.					criterion
1.B1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	Expectations	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in Math, ELA or both.	is below		•		proficient, includi y of enrolling dist	
			Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts	
			ELA	16%	5.77%	21.8%	43.8%	
			Math	0%	-	-	23.9 %	



1.B.2 English Language Proficiency	Not Rated		The school did not have enough EL students to make an accountability determination for this criterion
1.B.3 Growth	Does Not Meet Expectations	The school earned 1 point each for growth in both ELA and Math as published in the statewide accountability system.	The school earned one point for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.82 out of 2. It earned one point for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.65 out of 2.

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2017-18, the ratings reflect the information in the FY17 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 18.58
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	Not Rated		Days of cash on hand is not reported for this district charter
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.18. The GASB 68 pension accounting standards requirement resulted in the school reporting a deficit net position on its FY17 audited financial statements and a debt to asset ratio of 1.68. The deficit net position is not the result of an operating deficit but results from recognition of its proportionate share of the state's pension liability for its teachers. The school's financial statements present a positive net position before the effect of the GASB 68 reporting requirements. The calculation used to determine the school's debt



			to asset ratio of 0.18 was based total liabilities and assets before the effect of GASB 68 reporting.
1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Approaches Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is negative OR The most recent year total margin is negative.	The most recent year's total margin was -0.01. The three-year aggregate margin was 0.0092.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		The debt service coverage ratio is not applicable. The charter did not have principal or interest payments in FY17

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations," with the exception of 2.2 which was rated "Approaches Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2017-18.
2.2 School Environment	Approaches Expectations	One of the following is true: The school's attendance rate is lower than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE	Student Attendance: The school's attendance rate was 85.48%, lower than the state high school average of 90.83% Family engagement: The charter provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Student Retention: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.



		There is no evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families Fewer 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year.	
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	Attrition Data: The charter provided assurances of attrition data analysis in the School-Prepared Annual Report. Recruitment & Lottery: No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle. Applicant Pool: The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2018 lottery shows applicants from Cranston and the surrounding communities.
2.4 Dissemination	Meets Expectations	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	Sharing and Partnership: The charter provided assurances and descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice. Specifically, sharing classroom strategies for blended learning with Cranston Public Schools and sharing curriculum with the Construction program at PCTA
2.5 Board and		The board and school leader	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: The charter



Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations"



Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	3.1: Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. 3.2: IDEA: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. 3.3: English Language Learners: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. 3.4: Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support 3.5: Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	3.6: Educator Certification: A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. 3.7:HR Procedures: The charter provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. 3.8: Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation data identified discrepancies in evaluated personnel compared to reported personnel in the personnel assignment submission (PAS). While there are no unresolved materials violations, the discrepancies will be corrected in the following year.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.9: Facility Documentation & Assurances: The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report. 3.10: School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. 3.11: Food Service: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.



			3.12: Behavior & Safety Policies: The charter provided assurances of behavior and safety policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.13: Educational Program: The charter provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report. 3.14: Curriculum Standards: The charter provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report. 3.15: Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting. 3.16: School Day/Length Policy: The charter school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.17: Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. 3.18: Board Bylaws: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. 3.19: Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.20: Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: The charter complied with budget submissions. 3.21: Quarterly Financial Reporting: The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports. 3.22-3.23: UCOA Reporting: The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit.



3.24-3.27: Annual Financial Audit: The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. 3.28: Single Audit: N/A



Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	1.A.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet" and 1.A.2 is rated as "Exceeds," "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's star rating was 1-star and the. The school did have RIDE-approved school specific goals in 2018-19.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School R	ating Detail				
Annual Rating	Does Not Meet Expectations	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."		ol was rated 3.2 and 1.B.		Not Meet	Expectation	ons" on criterion
1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	Does Not Meet Expectations	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in Math, ELA or both.	is below				•	including error, ing districts in
			Subject	School's % Proficient	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
			ELA	15.79	5.55	10.24	21.34	42.01
			Math	0.00	-	-	-	17.70



1.B.2 English Language Proficiency	Does Not Meet Expectations Not Rated	The school earned 1 ELP Progress point as measured by school index score published in the statewide school accountability.	The school earned one ELP point as measured by the statewide accountability system. The school's ELP index score was 29 out of 110.
1.B.3 Growth	Does Not Meet Expectations	The school earned 1 point each for growth in both ELA and Math as published in the statewide school accountability system.	The school earned one point for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.83 out of 2. It earned one point for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.79 out of 2.

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2018-19, the ratings reflect the information in the FY18 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 18.58
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	Not Rated		Days of cash on hand is not reported for this district charter
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.26 The GASB 68 pension accounting standards requirement resulted in the school reporting a deficit net position on its FY18 audited financial statements and a debt to asset ratio of 1.76. The deficit net position is not the result of an operating deficit but results



			from recognition of its proportionate share of the state's pension liability for its teachers. The school's financial statements present a positive net position before the effect of the GASB 68 reporting requirements. The calculation used to determine the school's debt to asset ratio of 0.26 was based total liabilities and assets before the effect of GASB 68 reporting.
1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Approaches Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is negative OR The most recent year total margin is negative.	The most recent year's total margin was -0.033. The three-year aggregate margin was 0.005 Due to presentation of the audit with and without the effect of GASB 68, the net position is reported not including depreciation, non-operating revenue, and net investment of capital assets. These items are added back into revenue and expenses to ensure an accurate presentation of total and aggregate margin.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		The debt service coverage ratio is not applicable. The charter did not have principal or interest payments in FY18

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets or Exceeds Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2017-18.



2.2 School Environment	Approaches Expectations	One of the following is true: The school's attendance rate is lower than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE There is no evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families Fewer 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year.	Student Attendance: The school's attendance rate was 87.17%, lower than the state high school average of 90.91% Family engagement: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school engages parents and families. Student Retention: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	Attrition Data: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school tracks attrition data and reviews it with the board each month. Recruitment & Lottery: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school has established recruitment, lottery and retention policies. The March 1, 2019 lottery was monitored. Applicant Pool: The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2019 lottery shows applicants from sending communities across the state. The current student body represents 12 RI cities or towns, with the majority from Cranston.



2.4 Dissemination	Meets Expectations	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	Sharing and Partnership: Document review and the renewal site visit show that the school has an open door policy for visits and partners with their district, Cranston. The school presented at the 2019 PrepareRI summit and has an ongoing partnership with LIUNA (Laborers International Union of North America)
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality		The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board and school leader are regularly monitoring progress related to student's academic achievement and charter's strategic priorities. Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/Communication: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board uses a committee structure to facilitate policy and decision-making as well as a working relationship with the Cranston School Committee. Board Holds School Leader Accountable: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board holds the Executive Director accountable through annual evaluations conducted by Cranston's superintendent.

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."



		rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.1: Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. 3.2: IDEA: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. 3.3: English Language Learners: No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support. 3.4: Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. 3.5: Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.6: Educator Certification: A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. 3.7: HR Procedures: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of documented employee rights and procedures as established by Cranston Public Schools. 3.8: Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation data identified no outstanding issues.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	3.9: Facility Documentation & Assurances: The charter provided documentation of safety inspections, certificate of occupancy and other related documentation.



			 3.10: School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified. As a district-charter a review of the school-specific Annual School Health Report was not conducted. 3.11: Food Service: No outstanding issues were identified. A formal review of the Cranston School District was conducted, but the individual school was not part of the review. 3.12: Behavior & Safety Policies: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of student and staff handbooks with documented safety procedures and discipline policies.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.13: Educational Program: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school is practicing the essential educational program components defined by its charter and following state and federal requirements. 3.14: Curriculum Standards: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that curricula is aligned to statewide standards. 3.15: Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in education related reporting. 3.16: School Day/Length Policy: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school has adopted and implemented these policies.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.17: Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: There is evidence from school assurances, document review, and the renewal site visit that the board complied with posting agendas and minutes for public meetings, public record requests and the Code of Ethics. 3.18: Board Bylaws: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board maintains and implements its bylaws. 3.19: Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board has established policies and procedures for addressing



			conflicts of interest and complaints.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	 3.20: Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: The charter complied with budget submissions. 3.21: Quarterly Financial Reporting: The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports. 3.22-3.23: UCOA Reporting: The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. 3.24-3.27: Annual Financial Audit: The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and the school's auditors did not identify signification deficiencies or material weaknesses. 3.28: Single Audit: N/A